PERSEREC

Technical Report 05-1
November 2004

Crime Self-Reporting Study: Phase I

Kelly R. Buck
Defense Personnel Security Research Center

Andrée E. Rose
Northrop Grumman Mission Systems

Approved for Public Distribution:
Distribution Unlimited

Research Conducted by
Defense Personnel Security Research Center

Technical Report 05-1 **November 2004**

Crime Self-Reporting Study: Phase I

Kelly R. Buck
Defense Personnel Security Research Center

Andrée E. Rose
Northrop Grumman Mission Systems

Released by
James A. Riedel
Director

Defense Personnel Security Research Center
99 Pacific Street, Suite 455-E
Monterey, California 93940-2497

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED *(From – To)*
01 11 2004	Technical	1/1/2000 – 12/31/2000

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Crime Self-Reporting Study: Phase I

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)

Kelly R. Buck
Andree E. Rose

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Defense Personnel Security Research Center
99 Pacific Street, Bldg. 455-E
Monterey, CA 93940-2497

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

TR 05-1

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Defense Personnel Security Research Center
99 Pacific Street, Bldg. 455-E
Monterey, CA 93940-2497

10. SPONSORING/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSORING/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Unrestricted Distribution

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

The PERSEREC Crime Self-Reporting Study covers criminal record checks conducted in CY00 on 14,470 subjects of DoD security clearance investigations, including uniformed military, civilian, and contractor personnel. Information found in these record checks was compared with subjects' responses to questions pertaining to criminal charges, arrests, and convictions on the Standard Form 86: Questionnaire for National Security Positions. Differences in rates of self-reporting were evaluated based on military status (military vs. nonmilitary), gender, age of subject at time of offense, age of subject at time of application, time elapsed since offense, type of investigation, type of offense to be reported (felonies and nonfelony alcohol, drug, firearms or explosives, miscellaneous other), level of investigation, and whether subjects were undergoing initial investigation or periodic reinvestigation. Variables that were most strongly associated with self-reporting of offense information were type of offense to be reported, military status, level of investigation, age at time of self-report, and recency of offenses. Overall, subjects reported alcohol-related offenses at higher rates than other types of offenses. The rate of self-reporting was lower among subjects undergoing NACLC investigations than those designated as NAC or SSBI, though the higher rate of reporting among NAC subjects was an artifact of the investigative process subjects were undergoing. Military subjects were less likely than nonmilitary subjects to self-disclose reportable offenses. Females tended to be less likely to report than males. Offenses that occurred between 3 months and a year after the date of self-report were among the least likely to be reported in NACLC and SSBI investigations, but were not significantly different in NAC investigations, suggesting this finding may be due to delays in investigations rather than subjects' reluctance to report relatively recent offenses. For offenses where subjects were asked "have you ever" been arrested, charged, or convicted, offenses that were more than 10 years old were reported at lower rates than more recent offenses.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

National Security, Criminal Record, Self-report, Smith Amendment, Criminal Justice, Deception, Security Clearance, Standard Form 86, felony, alcohol, drug, firearms, explosives, adjudication, investigation.

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF REPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			James A. Riedel, Director
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified		70	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER *(Include area code)* 831-657-3000

Preface

This report examines subjects' rates of self-reporting of criminal arrests, charges, and convictions required to be disclosed when applying for national security clearances. Self-reports required in the completion of the personnel security questionnaire were compared with results from local and state agency checks to measure the extent of underreporting.

In a follow-up to this study, we will describe possible causes for underreporting based on our reviews of relevant literatures, briefings with relevant personnel, and evidence from Defense Office of Hearing and Appeals decisions. This second phase of research will draw on real-world perspectives from personnel in the field along with social psychological perspectives on deterrence, accounts, impression management, personnel integrity, response bias, and detection of deception in understanding and mitigating underreporting of derogatory information in personnel security investigations.

Using findings from these two phases of evaluation, recommendations will be offered for decision-makers to determine what changes, if any, should be made to the personnel security questionnaire completion process to increase rates of self-reporting.

James A. Riedel
Director

Executive Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine self-reporting of offenses by subjects as required in the course of Department of Defense (DoD) personnel security clearance investigations. Subjects are directed on their Standard Form 86: Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF86) to report felonies, offenses relating to firearms, explosives, alcohol, drugs, military court martial or disciplinary hearings, any pending charges, and any other arrests, charges, or convictions within the preceding 7 years, excluding traffic fines of less than $150. Previous research indicates high levels of underreporting, but without extensive consideration of differences based on subject and offense characteristics.

Method

Data on 14,470 subjects in this study were drawn from a population of 17,833 subjects for whom reportable arrest, charge or conviction data were discovered in the course of personnel security investigations during CY00. Data were obtained from two sources: reports of investigation (ROIs) and subjects' responses to questions pertaining to criminal charges, arrests, and convictions on the SF86. Subjects' response data were obtained from the DSS Case Control Management System (CCMS) which electronically stores data from the SF86. Associations between subject and offense characteristics and likelihood and rates of self-reporting were analyzed using multinomial regression and chi-square analyses.

Key Findings

- Overall, 38% of subjects with apparently reportable offenses did not indicate any criminal arrests, charges, or convictions on the SF86.

- Rates of self-reporting varied significantly based on type of offense to be reported. Alcohol-related offenses were among the most likely to be self-reported, and drinking and driving offenses were more likely to be reported than other alcohol-related offenses. Felony offenses and nonfelony offenses not related to alcohol, drugs, firearms, or explosives were among the least likely to be reported.

- Self-reporting tended to be lower among military subjects compared with nonmilitary subjects for those undergoing NACLC investigations. Among SSBIs, military subjects had slightly lower rates than nonmilitary subjects in self-reporting only for drinking and driving offenses.

- The difference between military NACLC and SSBI subjects was significant for all offense categories except firearms and explosives, whereas the difference between NACLC and SSBI nonmilitary subjects was significant only for drinking and driving offenses.

- Males tended to self-report at higher rates than females although differences were significant only for nonfelony drug and miscellaneous other offenses. One exception was that nonmilitary females with nonfelony, nondriving-related alcohol offenses were significantly more likely than males to self-report offense information.

- Overall, rates of self-reporting were not significantly different between subjects undergoing initial investigations and periodic reinvestigations (PR), except that PR subjects with nonfelony drinking and driving offenses or felony offenses that were 1 to 3 years old were more likely than initial investigation subjects to self-report at least one offense. For subjects with these same types of offenses that were more than ten years old, at least one offense was more likely to be reported in initial investigations than in periodic reinvestigations. In all other cases, subjects in initial investigations did not differ significantly from subjects undergoing periodic reinvestigations.

- Offenses less than 1 year old and offenses more than 10 years old were least likely to be reported. Offenses less than 1 year old could have occurred, however, after subjects completed their personnel security questionnaires. Otherwise, self-reporting rates did not vary according to the recency of the offense.

- There were not consistent differences by age group in self-reporting, controlling for recency and type of offense to be reported. Military subjects were less likely to report juvenile offenses than nonmilitary subjects.

- Subjects with multiple types of reportable offenses were as likely to report at least one offense as were subjects with only one type of offense.

- In states where investigators relied on state repository checks, subjects with nonfelony alcohol (excluding drinking and driving) and miscellaneous other types of offenses were more likely to report at least one offense than were subjects with similar types of offense records in states where investigators did not rely on state repository checks. Record check strategy was unrelated to self-reporting of felonies and of nonfelony drug, drinking and driving, and firearms- and explosives-related offenses.

Discussion and Recommendations

This research identified substantial underreporting of offense information by subjects in security clearance investigations. The extent of underreporting varied according to different subject and offense characteristics, some of which are actionable and some are not.

Specific recommendations for actions to mitigate underreporting will be offered in a Phase II study. We will describe possible causes for underreporting based on our reviews of relevant literatures, briefings with relevant personnel in the field, and evidence from Defense Office of Hearing and Appeals decisions. The second phase of research draws on real-world perspectives from expert personnel along with social psychological

theoretical perspectives on deterrence, accounts, impression management, personnel integrity, response bias, and detection of deception in understanding and mitigating underreporting of derogatory information in personnel security investigations. Based on findings from each of these sources, the Phase II report will offer recommendations for improving the rate of admission of reportable offenses on national security clearance questionnaires.

After reviewing our preliminary findings, the Directorate for Accession Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, has recommended that we obtain additional background characteristics of our military population to further explore factors associated with their higher rates of underreporting. For example, military personnel were particularly interested in associations between underreporting and service branch, rank, aptitude, and education.

Depending on the interest of policymakers, there may be value in adding additional years and/or sources of data to supplement those portions of our sample that were still too small, even with one full year of data, to enable drawing reliable conclusions about relationships between self-reporting and some offense and subject characteristics. For example, the number of subjects with firearms and explosives-related offenses were so few that analyses of self-reporting of these offenses often could not be conducted beyond evaluating overall rates, regardless of subject characteristics and other characteristics of the offense.

It may also be that this and other studies have sufficiently established that underreporting of criminal offense information is a problem, regardless of subject and offense characteristics. Since decision options for mitigating the problem are not likely to be exercised separately for each of the different types of offenses or based on whether subjects are old or young, male or female, the value of further analysis of differences by subject and offense characteristics may not warrant the expenditure of resources required to carry it out. Resources may be better spent on identifying causes and solutions, as will be done in Phase II.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine self-reporting of offenses by subjects applying for Department of Defense (DoD) security clearances. Subjects are directed on their Standard Form 86: Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF86) to report felonies, offenses relating to firearms, explosives, alcohol, drugs, military court martial or disciplinary hearings, any pending charges, and any other arrests, charges, or convictions within the preceding 7 years, excluding traffic fines of less than $150. Subjects are required to report these types of offenses regardless of whether the record in [their] case has been "sealed" or otherwise stricken from the record. The single exception to this requirement is for certain convictions under the Federal Controlled Substances Act for which the court issued an expungement order under the authority of 21 U.S.C. 844 or 18 U.S.C. 3607.

Previous studies on similar populations have found substantial underreporting of criminal records. Flyer (1995) found that fewer than half of military recruits with National Crime Information Center Interstate Identification Index (NCIC/III) records indicated arrest or convictions as required upon entering the Armed Forces. The types of offenses forwarded to the NCIC/III usually have to be of a certain severity. Otherwise, they are maintained only at the local and possibly state levels. Many of the offenses required to be reported on personnel security questionnaires, however, are not accessible through the NCIC/III. Furthermore, not all local and state criminal justice agencies consistently forward offense information that qualifies for inclusion in the NCIC/III (Flyer, 1995; Buck & Reed, 2003; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003). Our study adds to Flyer's findings by comparing self-reporting against specific criminal record information stored at local and state agencies.

A study by Frabutt (as cited in Connor, 1997) found that, between 1982 and 1989, 98% of Navy recruits with California state repository felony arrest records did not receive felony moral waivers to permit enlistment, suggesting that they did not self-report these offenses to their recruiters. Connor points out that since Frabutt's study was based on arrests without convictions as well as arrests with convictions, the percentage for which felony moral waivers would be appropriate may not be accurately represented as 98%, since felony moral waivers are based on convictions, not just arrests.

Connor (1997) researched the incidence and evaluated the implications of "hidden criminal backgrounds" in the military's recruitment process. He reviewed a 1996 briefing that reported that 25 to 40% of Navy recruits with criminal convictions did not receive appropriate moral waivers, suggesting that these offenses surfaced neither through self-reports nor recruiters' criminal record checks. In his own study, Connor compared self-reporting of felonies and nonfelonies among Illinois and Florida Naval recruits in the 1980s who were under the age of 25, controlling for various demographic and aptitude characteristics. Connor found the overall rate of unreported juvenile criminal convictions among subjects in Florida was 74%; among recruits with adult criminal history records in Illinois, the overall rate of underreported convictions was 45%.

Trent (1998) conducted a pilot study of 298 naval recruits and found that 29% (n = 18) of the 61 subjects in his sample with arrest records did not disclose them on the SF86. The 61 subjects in Trent's study included 23 who admitted to offenses that were not discovered through record checks. So, of the 38 subjects identified through national and local agency record checks as having arrest records, 47% did not disclose them on their SF86.

Buck and Reed (2003) used results of local, state agency, and NCIC/III checks to evaluate self-reporting by subjects in four states as part of a study on reliability of state repository records for screening personnel for national security clearances. They found that the rate of self-reporting of at least one offense by subjects with arrests, charges, or convictions required to be reported on the SF86 ranged from 50% to 80% depending on the type of offense to be reported. Since self-reporting was only supplemental information for their research, their study did not further explore the issue.

The study described in this report elaborated on the research of Flyer (1995), Connor (1997), Trent (1998) and Buck and Reed (2003) by analyzing the associations between different subject and offense characteristics and rates of self-reporting of derogatory criminal offense information among subjects undergoing investigations for national security clearances. Using reports of investigation provided by Defense Security Service (DSS) investigators, we identified the population of approximately 15,000 subjects from CY00 for whom local and state agency criminal record checks (LACs) surfaced offenses that should be reported on the Standard Form 86: Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF86). The results of these LACs, along with subjects' self-reports on the SF86, provided the basis for measuring the extent to which subjects self-disclose reportable offenses.

The next section details the source of our data, characteristics of our population and sample, and methods used to assess rates of self-reporting criminal offenses for various subgroups within our sample. Results for the study are then presented and summarized.

Methods

Data for this study were drawn from a population of 17,833 subjects for whom reportable arrest, charge or conviction data were discovered in the course of personnel security investigations during CY00. Data were obtained from two sources: reports of investigation (ROIs) from the Defense Security Service (DSS) during CY00, and subjects' responses to questions pertaining to criminal charges, arrests, and convictions on the Standard Form 86: Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF86). Subjects' response data were obtained from the DSS Case Control Management System (CCMS) which electronically stores information from the SF86. The following paragraphs describe the characteristics of the subjects, the measure of self-reporting, the coding of offense information, and the final sample on whom analyses were conducted.

Dependent Variable: Self-Reporting

The dependent variable for this study was whether subjects who have reportable offenses self-report them on their personnel security questionnaires. Self-reporting was indicated by responses to questions on the SF86 about whether subjects have been arrested for, charged with, or convicted of, several categories of offenses. Specifically, they were asked to answer "yes" or "no" to the following questions:

> 23a: Have you ever been charged with or convicted of any felony offense?
>
> 23b: Have you ever been charged with or convicted of a firearms or explosives offense?
>
> 23c: Are there currently any charges pending against you for any offense?
>
> 23d: Have you ever been charged with or convicted of any offense(s) related to alcohol or drugs?
>
> 23e: In the last 7 years have you been subject to court martial or other disciplinary proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice?
>
> 23f: In the last 7 years, have you been arrested for, charged with, or convicted of any offense that was not listed above as a response?

Only questions 23a, 23b, 23d, and 23f were used to evaluate subjects' self-reporting. These were the only categories that could be efficiently and reliably evaluated using ROIs. Many ROIs were written in a way that did not make clear whether charges were pending. For example, through no fault of their own, investigators may have only been able to find evidence of an arrest, but not a disposition. If the arrest was relatively recent, the charges could possibly be pending, though one could not know for certain. Due to this inherent ambiguity in the data, we did not measure responses to question 23c pertaining to pending charges.[1] We also excluded admissions to court martial or other disciplinary proceedings.[2]

Throughout the report, evaluations of self-reporting are based on whether subjects with known arrest or conviction records admit to anything, regardless of whether they record their admission to the question that would seem to be most appropriate for their offense. For example, subjects may report the least serious charges when multiple charges are filed against them. They may list convictions that reflect plea bargains down

[1] By not including admissions to pending charges, we risked exaggerating the rate of underreporting if subjects admitted their offenses only in this category. In reality, however, there were only 58 subjects representing .4% of the population who only indicated they had charges pending. The pending charges for these subjects represented at most .8% (for miscellaneous other offenses) of the total number of offenses in our study. Overall, reports of pending charges constitute .5% of the total number of self-reported offenses, a number too small to bias the results by its exclusion.

[2] We only included record checks at nonmilitary criminal justice agencies, such as municipal, county, and state law enforcement agencies and courts. Criminal records were obtained through military installations via Security Forces Squadrons and Office of Provost Marshals. Investigators did not consistently label these checks. So we were not sufficiently confident that we had captured the population of military record checks for criminal offenses to include them in the analysis.

from less serious charges. They may report in the "miscellaneous other" category convictions for nonalcohol- or nondrug-related crimes that were initiated as alcohol- or drug-related arrests. By using subject self-reports of at least one offense as a dependent variable, we allow for the possibility that subjects intend to honestly report offense information but for some reason do not record it specifically as requested, based on a precise interpretation of questions on the SF86.

Self-reports of any offense, regardless of whether specific offenses are recorded in the correct question of the SF86, provide a measure that errs on the side of subjects self-reporting. To the extent that subjects in our study do not report any offense information, we have a clear indication that they are withholding information.

As shown in Table 1, self-report data were not available for 14% (N = 2,459) of the subjects in the population. Fifty-three percent (N = 9,493) indicated they had at least one offense and almost 33% (N = 5,846) did not self-report any offense.

Table 1
Proportion of Subjects in the Population with Reportable Criminal Offenses Who Self-Report at Least One Offense

Subject Self-Reports	*%*	*N*
Self-report data not available	13.8	2,459
Subject does not self-report	32.8	5,846
Subject reports at least one offense	53.3	9,493
Total	100.0	17,798

While most analyses in this study will emphasize self-reporting of any offense, we do measure the extent to which subjects self-disclose specific offenses that are consistent with the nature of offense information recorded from the ROIs. For example, a subject with a felony arrest who answers "yes" to the SF86 question that asks whether he has ever been charged with or convicted of a felony would have self-reported the specific offense. If he answered "no" to the question specifically about felonies, but answered "yes" to any other question, he would be coded as having self-reported at least one offense, or "any offense."

Table 2 describes the proportion of subjects with reportable offenses who self-report a specific type of offense. Within this group, 38% (n = 5,846) do not self-report offenses. Only 10% self-reported a felony offense and even fewer (n = 342) self-reported a nonfelony firearms or explosives related offense. Forty-one percent (n = 6,796) self-report a nonfelony alcohol or drug offense whereas 28% (n = 4,606) indicate a nonfelony miscellaneous other offense.

Table 2
Proportion of Offenses Self-Reported By 14,470 Subjects with NonMissing Self-Report Data*

Type of Offense	*%*	*n*
Subject indicates no reportable offenses	38.1	5,846
Felony	9.8	1,627
Nonfelony Alcohol or Drug-Related	41.0	6,796
Nonfelony Firearms or Explosives-Related	2.1	342
Nonfelony Miscellaneous Other	27.8	4,606

*Total of column of percentages exceeds 100% and total of number of offenses is greater than total number of subjects because subjects may self-report in more than one category of offense.

Independent Variables

Independent variables for the study were obtained by coding subject and offense characteristics evident in ROIs. Subject characteristics included military status, gender, age at time of application, and type of investigation they were undergoing. Offense characteristics included type of offense, age of subject at time of offense, recency of offense, and number of different types of offenses associated with a subject. These data were available for 14,470 of the original population of 17,833 subjects.

The sample includes subjects for whom subject characteristic and self-reporting data were available minus subjects whose offenses may have occurred after they completed their SF86. They were also excluded if the dates of their offenses appeared to occur within 3 months after the date their date of application. This was done to ensure that subjects whose records were generated after they answered relevant questions on the SF86 were not counted as nonreporters.[3]

The sample also excludes offenses that are not required to be reported if they are older than 7 years. Some of the questions ask subjects if they have "ever" been charged or convicted of felony, firearms, explosives, drug, and alcohol offenses. For nonfelony miscellaneous other offenses, they are only required to report offenses occurring "within the last 7 years."

Subject Characteristics

Table 3 describes characteristics of the subjects for the sample of 14,470 individuals.

Gender. The majority of subjects were male (88%; n = 12,770); 1,578 or 11% of subjects were female.

[3] Concern has been raised that a 90-day window may not be a long enough period of time due to typically slow investigations. Conclusions based on any findings pertaining to recency effects should take this possibility into account.

Age at Application. The smallest age group consisted of subjects who were under the age of 18 (n = 30, 2%). The largest age group was "18 up to 22 years," representing 32% (n = 4,650) of the subjects in the sample.

Table 3
Characteristics of Subjects in the Sample of 14,470 Subjects

Applicant Characteristics		*%**	*n*
Gender	Female	10.9	1,578
	Male	88.3	12,770
Age of Subject at Time of Application	Less than 18 years old	2.1	304
	18 up to 22 years old	32.1	4,650
	22 up to 26 years old	17.8	2,579
	26 up to 31 years old	13.2	1,912
	31 up to 36 years old	10.1	1,465
	36 up to 41 years old	9.3	1,352
	41 years and Older	12.7	1,837
Military Status	Nonmilitary	24.4	3,532
	Military	75.6	10,938
Type of Investigation	Initial Investigation	86.5	12,512
	Periodic Reinvestigation	13.5	1,958
Level of investigation	NAC	5.5	805
	NACLC	72.9	10,551
	SSBI	21.5	3,113

*****Percentages within sets of subject characteristics may not total to 100% due to missing data.

Military Status. Military personnel made up 76% (n = 10,938) of the sample whereas 24% (n = 3,532) were nonmilitary personnel. Subjects were coded according to their military status using the case control number associated with their investigation. The last three digits of this number indicated whether they were uniformed military or DoD civilians or contractors. Uniformed military personnel are those who have enlisted in the armed services, whereas nonmilitary are nonenlisted DoD federal government personnel or personnel employed in the private sector working on DoD projects. There were too few subjects among civilian federal employees and contractors to conduct analyses on these two groups separately.

Type of Security Clearance Investigation. Most of the subjects in this sample were undergoing initial investigations (87%; n = 12,512) whereas the remaining 1,958 (13%) were undergoing periodic reinvestigations. Seventy-three percent (n = 10,541) were undergoing a National Agency Check with Local Agency Checks (NACLC) investigation, characteristic of Secret-level security clearances, while 22% (n = 3,113) were undergoing a Single Scope Background Investigation (SSBI), characteristic of Top

Secret and Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) security clearances. Approximately 5% of the subjects were military applicants and contractor personnel undergoing trustworthiness determinations.

With respect to criminal record checks, NACs entail National Agency Checks of FBI databases for all subjects. Local agency checks are then conducted only in those cases where subjects admit to offenses or the NCIC III identifies offenses. Therefore, all self-reporting results in our study for the group of subjects undergoing NACs are biased in favor of self-reporting.

Number of offense categories per subject. The number of offense categories reflects the number of subjects who have offenses that fall into more than one category of offense required to be reported on the SF86. For example, a subject may have been charged with three separate offenses – alcohol, drugs and a gun-related offense. Because each of these offenses has its own category, the subject is said to be found within three offense categories, i.e., more than one category. As shown in Table 4, offenses for most subjects (87%; n = 12,652) fall into one category.

Table 4
Number of Subjects with Multiple Offenses That Fall into More than One Offense Category Required to be Reported on the SF86.

Offense Categories	*%*	*n*
One category of offense	87.4	12,652
More than one category of offense	12.6	1,818

Offense Characteristics

Reports of investigation provided summaries of any offense information found by investigators through local and state agency checks (LACs). LACs included checks of (a) police and sheriff departments, (b) municipal, county, state, and federal courts and district attorneys, and (c) regional, state and federal centralized criminal record repositories. LACs were coded by date of offense, level of offense, and category of offense.

Level of Offense. Offenses were coded as either being felonies or nonfelonies. The nonfelony offense category included misdemeanors as well as some offenses, such as public intoxication, that are citations in some states but misdemeanors in others. For example, Pennsylvania law classifies as summary offenses (i.e., citations, tickets, or written summons to appear) many offenses that would be misdemeanors in other states. It is beyond the scope of this project to catalogue which offenses in which states incur citations, summons, or possible arrest. Therefore, when offenses were not clearly listed by investigators as a felony, they were collapsed into one "Nonfelony" category.

Table 5 describes the levels of offenses found within the sample. The majority of offenses were categorized as nonfelonies (81%; n = 13,343) whereas felony offenses made up 16% of the sample (n = 2,688). The level of offense could not be determined for 535 offenses.

Table 5
Characteristics of the 16,566 Offenses in the Sample

Offense Characteristics		*%*	*n*
Level of Offense	Felony	16.2	2,688
	Nonfelony	80.6	13,343
	Unknown	3.2	535
Types of Offenses	Alcohol-Related	43.5	7,214
	Drug-Related	7.6	1,255
	Firearm / Explosives	1.6	271
	Misc. Other	47.2	7,826

Type of Offense to Be Reported. Types of offenses were coded as alcohol-related, drug-related, firearms or explosives-related, or as "Miscellaneous Other," indicating some other type of offense. These categories correspond to the offense categories specifically asked about on the SF86. Felonies indicate the most serious offenses; most state statutes define felonies as crimes punishable by 1 year or more in prison. Alcohol offenses include drinking and driving, which is labeled "DUI" throughout the remainder of the report, and other alcohol-related offenses such as possession of alcohol by a minor, public intoxication, and providing minors with alcohol. Drug offenses relate to any crime involving illegal substances. Firearms- and explosives-related offenses involve illegal possession or use of a gun or other explosive material. Miscellaneous other offenses include all other nonfelony offenses not listed above, excluding all vehicle code violations with fines of less than $150. Miscellaneous other offenses cover such crimes as theft, assault, forgery, molestation, etc.

As mentioned earlier, each case in the sample represented a single category of offense, but not necessarily a single offense. Subjects have more than one record in the sample if they have multiple offenses that fall in more than one category required to be reported on the SF86. For example, a subject with three nonfelony alcohol arrests and no other offenses would have one case in the sample in the "Alcohol-Related Offense" category, as would a subject with one DUI. A subject with one nonfelony DUI and one nonfelony assault would have two cases.

All felony level offenses were classified in the "Felony" category, regardless of the nature of the offense. So, a subject with a felony DUI and a nonfelony DUI would have two cases: one in the "Felony" category and one in the nonfelony "Alcohol" category.

As shown in Table 5, almost half (47%; n = 7,826) of the offenses were found to be miscellaneous other offenses. Alcohol-related offenses (44%; n = 7,211) made up the next largest category. There were 1,255 (8%) drug offenses and 271 (2%) firearms/explosive-related offenses.

Age of Subject at Time of Offense. Offenses were coded according to the age of the subject at the time the offense (or most recent offense if more than one offense within

a category) was committed and the amount of time that had elapsed between the date of offense and the date the subject completed the SF86. These measures were based on coding of the date of offense in the ROI. The date of offense referred to the month and year of arrest, summons, or citation if available. Otherwise it referred to the date of disposition. Cases were excluded from the study if no date could be determined.

Data on the age of offender at the time of offense are provided in Table 6. A little more than two-thirds of subjects were 25 years of age or younger at the time of the offense. Forty-one percent of the subjects were between the ages of 18 and 22 when their offense occurred. The age group with the smallest number of offenders consisted of those between 36 and 41 years of age (5%; n = 777). Those ages 41 and over at the time of the offense were combined into a single category because there were fewer older offenders. Age of subject at time of offense could not be determined in approximately 5% of the cases (n = 758).

Table 6
Age of Offender at Time of Offense

Age at Time Of Offense	***%***	***n***
Less than 18 years	13.3	2,210
18 up to 22 years	41.2	6,825
22 up to 26 years	13.6	2,260
26 up to 31 years	9.8	1,627
31 up to 36 years	7.4	1,230
36 up to 41 years	4.7	777
41 years of age and older	5.3	879
Missing data	4.6	758

Recency of Offense. This variable was calculated by adding the number of days between the date of the offense and the date the investigation was requested. The total number of days was then collapsed into the categories listed in Table 7. Two-thirds of the offenses occurred between 3 months and 5 years preceding the subject's application for security clearance. One-third of the offenses occurred within 1 to 3 years preceding the application for security clearance and 18% (n = 2,949) of the offenses occurred over 7 years before the application was completed. These latter offenses only include felonies and nonfelony firearms, explosives, alcohol and drug offenses. All other types of offenses older than 7 years were not required to be reported.

Table 7
Recency of Offense: Time Elapsed Between Dates of Offense and Application

Time Elapsed	*%*	*n*
91 up to 365 Days	12.1	2,002
1 year up to 3 years	33.6	5,566
3 years up to 5 years	19.5	3,225
5 years up to 7 years	12.5	2,062
7 years up to 10 years	6.9	1,138
More than 10 years	10.9	1,811
Missing data	4.6	762

State in Which Record Check Was Conducted. Variables controlling for record check strategy and whether records were stored in open record states relied on coding each offense by the state in which its record was stored. These data are provided in Appendix A. Offenses from the state of New Jersey were not included in this study because New Jersey has a different system for classifying offense levels. The SF86 specifically asks subjects to answer whether they have been arrested for, charged with, or convicted of a felony, but New Jersey does not classify any offenses as felonies. Rather, offenses are either indictable or nonindictable. Because this study controls for level of offense to include felonies, offenses from New Jersey were excluded.

Whether Record Stored in Open Record State. Table 8 shows the proportion of offenses found within open record states, where anyone has access to criminal records for any purpose, compared to states that place restrictions on access to criminal records. Just over 15% of the offenses in this study were found in open record states.

Table 8
Proportion of Offense Records Found in Open Record States

Open Record State Status	*%*	*n*
Offenses in Open Record States	15.1	2,509
Offenses in Restricted Record States	84.9	14,057

Records Check Strategy. Table 9 shows the proportion of offenses found within states where the majority of record checks are conducted through local police and sheriff departments and courts versus states where the majority of checks are submitted through centralized statewide repositories. Nearly two-thirds of the record checks (65%, n = 5,754) were conducted in states where the usual point of entry by investigators into the criminal record system was the state repository.

Table 9
Proportion of Offense Records Found by Record Check Strategy

Record Check Strategy	*%*	*n*
Local Agency Checks	34.7	5,754
Statewide Checks	65.3	10,812

Cross-tabulations of Independent Variables

Table 3 above showed that approximately 75% of our sample was comprised of uniformed military subjects (n = 10,938), whereas 25% (n = 3,532) are DoD civilians or contractors. Because the number of uniformed military subjects available for this study was so much larger than the number of nonmilitary subjects, we had to use caution in interpreting independent effects if they were disproportionately associated with the military population. Each independent variable was cross-classified with military status to assess the extent to which military and nonmilitary subjects differed. Results are shown in Table 10.

As shown in Table 10, differences between military and nonmilitary subjects were statistically significant, based on Pearson chi-square analyses, for every subject and offense characteristic except number of different types of offenses to be reported. Given the large sample size, however, statistical significance was sometimes found where the size of the difference did not appear to be strategically significant. With a large enough sample, differences of a few percentage points may achieve statistical significance without indicating meaningful or actionable differences.

With respect to types of offenses reported, the nonmilitary population had a much higher proportion of reportable nonfelony drinking and driving offenses with 42% compared to 21% for nonmilitary subjects. Military subjects had a higher proportion of nonfelony other alcohol-related offenses at 20% compared to 11% for nonmilitary. The highest proportion of reportable offenses for military subjects was miscellaneous other offenses at 35% of all reportable offenses. Among nonmilitary subjects, these types of offenses constituted only 22% of all reportable offenses. Nonfelony drug-related offenses constituted about 4-5% percent of both military and nonmilitary subjects' reportable offenses. Approximately 15% of the offenses for military and 18% of offenses for nonmilitary subjects entailed felony-level arrests, charges or convictions. Firearms- and explosives-related offenses comprised less than 1% of all reportable offenses for both groups.

A higher proportion of investigations consisted of NACs among the military subjects (7%) than for the nonmilitary population (2%). For both groups, the majority of investigations were NACLCs (72% military; 75% nonmilitary). Twenty percent of military subjects' investigations and 23% of nonmilitary subjects investigations were SSBIs.

Table 10
Distributions of Subject and Offense Characteristics by Military Status†

	Subject or Offense Characteristic	Military %	NonMilitary %	Total %
Type of Offense to be Reported*	Drug	5.0	4.1	4.8
	DUI	20.6	41.7	25.7
	Felony	15.6	18.3	16.2
	Firearms or Explosives	0.6	1.0	0.7
	Miscellaneous Other	34.8	21.7	31.6
	Other Alcohol	19.9	10.8	17.7
Type of Investigation**	NAC	6.6	2.4	5.6
	NACLC	72.3	75.0	74.0
	SSBI	21.2	22.6	21.5
Initial or Periodic Reinvestigation**	Initial Investigation	88.3	80.8	86.5
	Periodic Reinvestigation	11.7	19.2	13.5
Gender**	Female	9.9	14.0	10.9
	Male	89.4	84.8	88.3
Recency of Offense*	91 to 365 days	14.1	5.7	12.5
	1 to 2 years	38.2	19.9	35.1
	3 to 4 years	19.9	18.7	20.4
	5 to 7 years	11.4	16.5	13.1
	7 to 10 years	5.4	12.0	7.2
	Greater than 10 years	6.0	27.3	11.6
Age at Time of Offense*	LT 18 yrs	16.8	2.4	13.3
	18 up to 22 yrs	48.1	20.2	41.4
	22 up to 26 yrs	13.2	15.5	13.7
	26 up to 31 yrs	8.1	15.4	9.9
	31 up to 36 yrs	5.4	14.1	7.5
	36 up to 41 yrs	2.3	12.3	4.7
	41 Years of Age and Up	1.6	3.0	5.3
Age at Time of Application**	LT 18 yrs	2.7	0.2	2.1
	18 up to 22 yrs	41.5	3.2	32.1
	22 up to 26 yrs	20.2	10.4	17.8
	26 up to 31 yrs	13.2	13.3	13.2
	31 up to 36 yrs	8.9	14.0	10.1
	36 up to 41 yrs	6.2	19.0	9.3
	41 and up	4.4	38.4	12.7
# of Different Offenses	One	86.0	87.9	86.4
	Two or More	14.0	12.1	13.6
Accessibility of Records*	Records are not open	83.9	87.9	84.9
	Open records	16.1	12.1	15.1
Record Check Strategy*	Local agency checks	36.0	30.8	34.7
	Statewide checks	64.0	69.2	65.3

†Percentages within sections may not total to 100% due to missing data.
*For offense characteristics: military n = 12,571; nonmilitary n = 3,995; total n = 16,566
**For subject characteristics: military n = 10,938; nonmilitary n = 3,532; total n = 14,470

The majority of offenses among both military and nonmilitary subjects were associated with males. For both groups of subjects, at least 85% of reportable offenses were committed by males, though military subjects had a slightly higher proportion of male subjects at 89%.

Military subjects were, on average, relatively younger than nonmilitary subjects, and, consequently, had a higher proportion of offenses committed at relatively younger ages. Among military subjects, 64% were under the age of 26, compared with 14% for nonmilitary. Seventy-eight percent of military subjects were under the age of 26 at the time of their offense, compared to 38% for nonmilitary.

The offenses associated with the military population tended to be more recent relative to the date of application than offenses by the nonmilitary subjects, due to the relatively younger age of the military subjects. Among the military subjects, 72% of the offenses in the sample occurred within 5 years of the date of application, compared with 44% among nonmilitary subjects for the same time period. Nearly 40% of the offenses associated with nonmilitary subjects were at least 7 years old, compared with only 11% of the offenses among military subjects.

Military subjects had a slightly higher proportion of records stored in open record states at 16% compared to 12% for nonmilitary. Military subjects also had a slightly higher proportion of record checks conducted in states where investigators relied primarily on local agency checks rather than centralized statewide repository checks to identify arrest, charge, and conviction records. Of the record checks conducted for military subjects, 36% were in states where investigators relied on the local agency check strategy versus 31% for nonmilitary subjects.

Method of Analysis for Determining Where Significant Differences Exist

This study includes a large number of variables. Interactions between these variables can make it difficult to determine where true differences exist when comparing effects of different dimension, such as age and military status. With these two variables, most of the military population is young, and most offenders are young. So, if military subjects were found to self-report at a different rate than non-military subjects, one would have a difficult time knowing if the effects were due to their military status or their youth.

To parse out the presence of independent effects of any of the many variables included in this study, differences in the rates of self-reporting between different subjects, controlling for offense and subject characteristics were assessed using multinomial logistic regression (MLR) and cross-tabulation procedures based on the chi-square distribution. Due to the more technical nature of this stage of the analysis, further description of the method and the results of the analysis are provided in Appendix B.

Single variable cross-classifications with self-reporting are provided to show the nature of the association between those subject and offense characteristics found through MLR analysis to have significant effects on subjects' self-reports of criminal arrests, charges, and convictions.

All significance tests are based on measures of the amount of deviation of observed probabilities of self-reporting relative to expected likelihoods, interpreted according to the chi-square distribution. Alpha levels (p values) of greater than .05 are interpreted as indicating that observed probabilities of self-reporting are not sufficiently different from expected probabilities based on the distribution of subject and offense characteristics and self-reports among subjects to reject a null hypothesis that a given independent variable has no effect on likelihood of self-reporting.

Results

Self-Reporting of Offenses by Subjects

Table 11 shows for each type of arrest, charge or conviction the extent to which specific offenses are self-reported, as well as the extent to which at least one offense is reported. As expected, subjects' rate of reporting any offense was higher than their reporting of specific offenses.

These results indicate that different types of offenses are reported at different rates. As shown in the column "Self-Reports Specific Type of Offense," subjects with a nonfelony DUI offense self-reported at a rate of 71% and subjects who self-reported any other type of alcohol-related offense did so at a rate of almost 65%. Miscellaneous nonfelony (within last 7 years) offenders and firearm/explosive offenders reported at lower rates, with both groups reporting close to 44% of the time. Subjects with felony charges or convictions reported as such 29% of the time.

Table 11
Proportion of Subjects Who Self-Reported a Specific Type or Any Type of Arrest, Charge, or Conviction for Which Reportable Criminal Records Were Found

Type of Arrest, Charge, or Conviction Record Found For Subject	*Self-Reports Specific Type of Offense* %	*Self-Reports Any Type of Offense* %	*n*
Any Felony	29.2	56.0	2,688
Any Nonfelony Firearms/Explosive-Related	43.6	70.1	117
Any Nonfelony Drug-Related	53.7	64.5	792
Any Nonfelony DUI	71.0	76.6	4,257
Any Nonfelony Other Alcohol-Related	64.8	73.8	2,938
Nonfelony Other Miscellaneous within 7 Years	43.7	54.9	5,239

The proportion of subjects with reportable felony offenses who specifically self-reported a felony offense (29%) was most different from the proportion who reported at least one offense (56%), relative to subjects with other types of reportable offenses. Subjects with nonfelony firearm/explosive offenses also reported at least one offense at a

much higher rate (70%) than firearms- or explosives-related offenses specifically (44%). By comparison, subjects with alcohol-related offenses reported alcohol-specific offenses at rates more similar to their rates of reporting any type of offense.

These findings suggest that even though subjects may not disclose an offense within one of the SF86 questions specific to that offense, subjects may be providing evidence of such offenses in responses to other questions related to arrests, charges, and convictions. For example, a subject who was arrested for a felony-level offense but charged and/or convicted of a misdemeanor-level offense may answer "yes" to the question that references miscellaneous nonfelony offenses. Or, subjects who were arrested for discharge of a firearm within city limits but convicted only of disorderly conduct may not answer "yes" to the question asking specifically about firearms- and explosives- related offenses, but instead record their offenses in the miscellaneous other offense category.

Self-Reporting by Type of Offense and Military Status

As shown in Table 12, military and nonmilitary subjects who had been arrested for, charged with, or convicted of, nonfelony nonDUI alcohol offenses or a nonfelony firearm- or explosives-related offenses self-reported at least one offense at the same rate. For all other categories of offenders, military subjects were less likely than nonmilitary subjects to self-report at least one offense. Among subjects with felony-level reportable arrests, charges, or convictions, 52% of 1,958 military subjects self-reported at least one offense, compared with 68% of 730 nonmilitary subjects. Nonmilitary subjects with nonfelony DUIs self-reported at least one offense in 82% of 1,667 cases, whereas military subjects self-reported in 73% of 2,590 cases. Nonmilitary subjects with nonfelony drug offenses found through LACs self-reported at least one offense in 72% of 163 cases, whereas military subjects self-reported in 62% of 629 cases. Among subjects with other nonfelony offenses within the 7 years preceding the date of their security clearance application, 64% of nonmilitary applicants self-disclosed at least one offense, whereas 53% of 4,371 military subjects self-reported at least one offense.

Table 12 below does not show a significant difference between military and nonmilitary for other alcohol offenses whereas the multinomial logistic regression results in Table B-2 in Appendix B indicated that there was. One possible explanation for this is that the nonmilitary subjects in our study were, on average, older than the military population. And other nonfelony alcohol offenses other than DUIs tend to be youthful indiscretions of public intoxication and underage possession of alcohol. Younger subjects with other alcohol offenses may self-report according to a different set of influences than older subjects self-reporting nonDUI alcohol charges, arrests, and convictions. Results that examine differences between military and nonmilitary subjects controlling for age of subject and type of offense are provided in Appendix C.

Table 12
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Military Status

Type of Offender	*Military Status*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug*	Military	62.5	629	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Nonmilitary	72.4	163	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
DUI**	Military	73.1	2,590	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Nonmilitary	82.1	1,667	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Felony**	Military	51.6	1,958	■■■■■■■■■■
	Nonmilitary	67.8	730	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Firearms or Explosives	Military	69.2	78	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Nonmilitary	71.8	39	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Misc. Other**	Military	53.0	4,371	■■■■■■■■■■■
	Nonmilitary	64.2	868	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Other Alcohol	Military	73.9	2,506	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Nonmilitary	73.5	432	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

*p<.05 for differences between military status within the listed category of offense
**p<.01 for differences between military status the listed category of offense

Self-Reporting by Level of Investigation

Table 13 shows that the rate of self-reporting was strongly related to the type of security clearance for which subjects were applying. For each category of offender, subjects requiring a NACLC were less likely to self-disclose offenses than were subjects requiring SSBIs, although the results were not statistically significant for drug and firearms- and explosives-related offenses. Subjects undergoing entrance NAC investigations also were more likely than subjects applying for secret-level clearances to self-report at least one offense.

Table 13
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Level of Investigation

Type of Offender	*Level of Investigation*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	NAC	65.5	58	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	63.1	653	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	75.3	81	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
DUI**	NAC	79.2	178	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	73.3	2,947	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	84.9	1,131	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Felony**	NAC	58.2	249	■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	53.6	2,013	□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	66.2	426	■■■■■■■■■■■■
Firearms or Explosives	NAC	50.0	4	■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	67.8	87	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	80.8	26	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Misc. Other**	NAC	70.7	355	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	52.4	3,997	□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	59.9	887	■■■■■■■■■■■
Other Alcohol**	NAC	84.1	113	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	70.7	2,099	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	81.1	726	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

**p<.01 for differences between level of investigation within the listed category of offense

As Tables 14.a and 14.b show, however, level of investigation was associated with self-reporting among the military population more than for the nonmilitary. For the military population (see Table 14.a), the magnitude of the difference in self-reporting by level of investigation was statistically significant for each type of offense to be reported except firearms- and explosives-related offenses. The lack of significance for this class of offenses was likely due to the small number of offenses in this category. For nonmilitary subjects (Table 14.b), level of investigation was associated with self-reporting only among nonfelony DUI offenders, where subjects undergoing NAC investigations were much more likely to self-report any offense than subjects undergoing NACLCs and SSBIs.

Table 14.a
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Level of Investigation: Military

Type of Offender	*Level of Investigation*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug*	NAC	67.3	55	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	60.4	515	□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	76.3	59	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
DUI*	NAC	79.3	135	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	68.6	1,740	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	82.8	715	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Felony*	NAC	56.8	227	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	47.9	1,435	□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	65.2	296	■■■■■■■■■■■■
Firearms or Explosives	NAC	50.0	4	■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	67.3	55	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	78.9	19	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Misc. Other*	NAC	70.4	335	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	49.9	3,314	□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	59.4	722	■■■■■■■■■■■■
Other Alcohol*	NAC	85.7	98	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	70.7	1,786	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	81.2	622	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

*p<.05 for differences between level of investigation within the listed category of offense

Table 14.b
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Offense and Level of Investigation: Nonmilitary

Type of Offender	*Level of Investigation*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	NAC	33.3	3	■■■■■■■
	NACLC	73.2	138	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	72.7	22	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
DUI*	NAC	79.1	43	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	80.0	1,207	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	88.5	416	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Felony	NAC	72.7	22	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	67.5	578	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	68.5	130	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Firearms or	NAC	n/a	0	n/a
Explosives	NACLC	68.8	32	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	85.7	7	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Misc. Other	NAC	75.0	20	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	64.4	683	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	61.8	165	■■■■■■■■■■■■
Other Alcohol	NAC	73.3	15	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	NACLC	70.9	313	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	SSBI	80.8	104	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

*p<.05 for differences between level of investigation within the listed category of offense

Self-Reporting by Military Status, Offense Type, and Level of Investigation

Table 15 compares rates of self-reporting by military status within levels of investigation and offense types. The top half of the table presents the percent of subjects who self-reported, and the relevant chi-square and significance values. The bottom portion of the table contains the total number of subjects within each group.

Statistical associations between self-reporting at least one offense and subjects with a NAC investigation were not significant across all types of offenders. Significant associations emerged among NACLC subjects with felony, DUI, drug and miscellaneous/other offenses. Within these groups of subjects, nonmilitary subjects were more likely to disclose criminal offenses compared to those in the military. Within the group of SSBI subjects, DUI offenders were the only group of subjects to produce statistically significant results, with nonmilitary once again reporting at a higher rate than military subjects.

Table 15
Self-Reporting of Any Offense, by Military Status and Security Clearance Level

Cell Contents	*Level of Investigation*	*Military*	*Felony*	*DUI*	*Other Alcohol*	*Drug*	*Firearm Explosive*	*Misc. Other*
% Who	NAC	Military	56.8	79.3	85.7	67.3	50.0	70.4
Self-		NonMil	72.7	79.1	73.3	33.3	0	75.0
Report Any	*Significance*	X^2	1.5	.0	1.5	1.5	N/A	.2
Offense	*Tests*	p	.149	.979	.222	.228	N/A	.664
% Who	NACLC	Military	47.9	68.6	70.7	60.4	67.3	49.9
Self-		NonMil	67.5	80.0	70.9	73.2	68.8	64.4
Report Any	*Significance*	X^2	64.2	47.4	.1	7.7	.0	48.0
Offense	*Tests*	p	.000	.000	.924	.006	.887	.000
% Who	SSBI	Military	65.2	82.8	80.8	76.3	78.9	59.4
Self-		NonMil	68.5	88.5	81.1	72.7	85.7	61.8
Report Any	*Significance*	X^2	.4	6.6	.0	.1	.2	.3
Offense	*Tests*	p	.513	.010	.919	.742	.698	.570
Total # of Offenders	NAC	Military	227	135	98	55	4	335
		NonMil	22	43	15	3	0	20
	NACLC	Military	1,435	1,740	1,786	515	55	3,314
		NonMil	578	1,207	313	138	32	683
	SSBI	Military	296	715	622	59	19	722
		NonMil	130	416	104	22	7	165

Self-Reporting by Type of Offense and Gender of Offender

An association with gender and self-reporting was due primarily to two types of offenses: nonfelony drug and nonfelony miscellaneous other arrests, charges, or convictions. As shown in Table 16, for both groups of offenders, females were less likely than males to self-report at least one offense on their SF86. Among drug offenders, 51% of 47 females self-reported, compared to 65% of 739 males. Among nonfelony miscellaneous other types of offenders, 45% of 722 females self-reported, compared with 56% of males. For alcohol-related offenses, there was a difference of approximately one percentage point in the rate at which males and females self-reported these types of offenses. For felony, drug, and miscellaneous other types of offenses, males tended to be more likely to self-report at least one offense.

Table 16
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Gender

Type of Offender	*Gender*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug*	Female	51.1	47	■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	65.1	739	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
DUI	Female	75.1	346	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	76.8	3,873	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Felony	Female	51.6	256	■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	56.5	2,404	□□□□□□□□□□□
Firearms or	Female	50.0	2	■■■■■■■■■■
Explosives	Male	70.2	114	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Misc. Other**	Female	45.2	722	■■■■■■■■■
	Male	56.4	4,483	□□□□□□□□□□□
Other Alcohol	Female	75.4	276	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	73.6	2,648	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

*p<.05 for differences between gender within the listed category of offense
**p<.01 for differences between gender within the listed category of offense

The association between type of offense, gender, and self-reporting of any offenses was different between military subjects and nonmilitary subjects. For military subjects, shown in Table 16.a, military males with nonfelony drug, and miscellaneous other offenses were significantly more likely to self-report than military females. The proportion of military males self-reporting in the other offense categories was also higher than for females, though differences did not meet statistically significant levels.

Among nonmilitary subjects, shown in Table 16.b, males were significantly more likely than females to self-report nonfelony miscellaneous other offenses, but were significantly less likely to report other alcohol offenses. Rates of self-reporting by nonmilitary males and females were equivalent for felony offenses and nonfelony drinking and driving offenses. There were too few nonmilitary females with nonfelony drug, firearms and explosives-related offenses for meaningful comparison.

Table 16.a
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Gender: Military

Type of Offender	*Gender*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug*	Female	47.1	34	■■■■■■■■■
	Male	63.1	591	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
DUI	Female	67.5	169	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	73.5	2,404	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Felony*	Female	43.0	149	■■■■■■■■■
	Male	52.4	1,796	□□□□□□□□□□
Firearms or	Female	n/a	0	n/a
Explosives	Male	68.8	77	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Misc. Other*	Female	43.6	555	■■■■■■■■■
	Male	54.4	3,789	□□□□□□□□□□□
Other Alcohol	Female	72.4	228	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	74.0	2,265	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

*p<.05 for differences between level of investigation within the listed category of offense

Table 16.b
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Gender: Nonmilitary

Type of Offender	*Gender*	*Self-Report Any Offense%*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug*	Female	61.5	13	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	73.0	148	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
DUI	Female	82.5	177	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	82.2	1,469	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Felony*	Female	63.6	107	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	68.6	608	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Firearms or	Female	n/a	2	n/a
Explosives	Male	68.8	37	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Misc. Other*	Female	50.3	167	■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	67.3	694	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Other Alcohol	Female	89.6	48	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Male	71.3	383	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

*p<.05 for differences between level of investigation within the listed category of offense

Self-Reporting by Type of Offense and Type of Investigation

Overall, the differences between rates of self-reporting by subjects based on whether they were undergoing an initial investigation or periodic reinvestigation were not sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis of no association, regardless of type of offense to be reported. There was a trend towards significance for nonfelony, nonDUI alcohol offenders (see Table 17). Among this group, subjects who were undergoing a periodic reinvestigation were less likely than subjects undergoing initial security clearance investigations to report at least one offense on their SF86. Self-reports of at

least one offense were made by 59% of the 183 subjects being reinvestigated who were found with nonfelony, nonDUI alcohol arrests, charges, or convictions, compared to 75% of the 2,755 subjects undergoing initial investigations. For all other types of offenders, the proportions of self-reports by subjects who were undergoing initial security clearance investigations were higher than for subjects undergoing periodic reinvestigations, but the differences were not as large as were found among the nonfelony, nonDUI alcohol offenders.[4]

Table 17
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Type of Investigation

Type of Offender	*Type of Investigation*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	Initial	65.0	754	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Periodic	55.3	38	□□□□□□□□□□□
DUI	Initial	77.1	3,258	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Periodic	75.2	999	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Felony	Initial	56.2	2,418	■■■■■■■■■■■
	Periodic	54.4	270	□□□□□□□□□□□
Firearms or Explosives	Initial	72.8	103	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Periodic	50.0	14	□□□□□□□□□□
Misc. Other	Initial	55.2	4,710	■■■■■■■■■■■
	Periodic	51.8	529	□□□□□□□□□□
Other Alcohol**	Initial	74.8	2,755	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Periodic	58.5	183	□□□□□□□□□□□□□

**p<.01 for differences between type of investigation within the listed category of offense

In discussing preliminary results with personnel security researchers, an issue was raised concerning delays in processing periodic reinvestigations in the time period covering data used in this study. If periodic reinvestigations were more likely to be delayed than initial investigations, then offenses less than 1 year old may well have occurred after the dates subjects completed their personnel security questionnaires. This would have biased rates of self-reporting in such a way that rates among periodic reinvestigations would appear lower. Therefore, analyses were run to assess the relationship between type of investigation and self-reporting, controlling for recency of offense.

Results are provided in Table 18. For offenses less than 1 year old where there were at least 20 offenders within each category of type of investigation, rates of self-reporting by type of investigation did not differ significantly. For offenses between approximately 1 and 3 years old, however, PRs with drinking and driving offenses or felony offenses were significantly more likely than subjects undergoing initial investigations to self-disclose at least one offense. For offenses more than 10 years old, however, the effect was exactly the opposite, with PRs being less likely to report drinking

[4] Results from Table 19 were consistent for both military and nonmilitary subjects. Therefore, in separate data displays are not provided.

and driving and felony offenses. Subjects undergoing periodic reinvestigations did not differ significantly from subjects undergoing initial investigations in the remaining categories of type and recency of offense.

Table 18
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense, Recency of Offense, and Type of Investigation†

Recency of Offense	*Type of Offense to be Reported*	*% Yes Initial*	*% Yes PR*	*Total n Initial*	*Total n PR*
91 to 365 days	DUI	56.4	55.2	312	58
	Misc. Other	43.3	39.7	690	58
1.1 to 3 years	DUI*	77.0	88.8	848	169
	Felony*	55.9	76.2	708	42
	Misc. Other	57.6	54.3	2018	184
	Other Alcohol	77.6	74.1	1034	27
3.1 to 5 years	DUI	83.0	80.0	560	160
	Felony	58.8	54.2	456	24
	Misc. Other	58.1	57.3	1103	150
	Other Alcohol	78.7	75.0	474	28
5.1 to 7 years	DUI	85.6	87.7	397	130
	Felony	63.3	46.2	281	26
	Misc. Other	55.3	46.2	660	117
	Other Alcohol	75.7	61.1	267	36
7.1 to 10 years	DUI	79.2	75.0	419	140
	Felony	54.7	60.7	258	28
GT 10 years	Drug	57.6	50.0	85	26
	DUI*	75.9	63.4	597	303
	Felony*	59.9	48.0	359	125
	Other Alcohol*	64.4	45.9	191	61

†Data not shown if fewer than 20 subjects within an offense category
*Significant difference, $p<.05$

Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Age at Application

Table 19 shows significant differences in rates of self-reporting for subjects depending on age at application and type of offender. Subjects who were older when they completed their SF86 tended to have higher self-report rates, exception for drug and other alcohol-related offenders, where subjects in their early to late twenties had higher rates of self-reporting. Subjects under the age of 18 with nonfelony DUI or miscellaneous other offenses self-reported at lower rates than older age groups.

Table 19
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Age at Application

Type of Offender	*Age at Application*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	LT 18 yrs	61.1	18	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	63.1	382	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	70.0	140	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	63.1	65	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	70.5	44	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	66.7	48	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	58.7	75	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
DUI**	LT 18 yrs	52.4	21	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	65.0	540	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	79.1	560	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	80.9	681	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	77.3	687	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	77.2	731	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	78.8	980	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
Felony**	LT 18 yrs	47.8	46	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	51.4	804	□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	60.5	478	■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	55.4	379	■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	53.1	260	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	63.7	237	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	60.8	401	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
Firearms or Explosives	18 up to 22 yrs	65.2	23	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	79.2	24	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	64.7	17	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	73.3	15	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	60.0	10	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	68.2	22	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
Misc. Other**	LT 18 yrs	50.9	159	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	53.1	2,052	□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	59.6	1,072	■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	55.9	651	■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	52.8	434	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	56.1	337	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	58.9	370	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
Other Alcohol**	LT 18 yrs	66.2	68	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	74.7	1,377	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	80.2	683	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	74.9	363	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	62.6	163	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	68.2	110	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	55.3	123	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙

**p<.01 for differences by age at application within the listed category of offense

Tables B-1 and B-2 in Appendix B show the relationships between applicant age, type of offense to be reported, and rate of self-reporting separately for military and nonmilitary subjects. For the military subjects, significant differences in self-reporting were found by age at application for nonfelony drug, DUI, miscellaneous other, and other alcohol offenses. For drug and other alcohol offenses, older subjects tended to report at lower rates relative to younger subjects. For DUI offenses, the youngest subjects were least likely to self-report.

For the nonmilitary subjects, differences in rates of self-reporting by age at application were found for nonfelony alcohol offenders and subjects with a felony-level arrest, charge or conviction. For DUI and felony offenders, Table 19 indicates that oldest and youngest subjects reported at somewhat lower rates. Among nonmilitary subjects with other alcohol offenses, rates of reporting were lower among the oldest and youngest subjects, but subjects over 40 reported at much lower rates.

Self-Reporting by Type of Offense and Amount of Time Elapsed Since Offense

Table 20 shows that for all types of offenders, subjects are least likely to report offenses on the SF86 if they occurred between 9-12 months after the date they completed their applications. The association is not statistically significant for nonfelony firearms/explosives related offenses, however, due to the small number of cases.

For subjects with nonfelony DUI-, other alcohol-, and drug-related offenses, self-reporting of offenses that were more than 10 years old was lower than for subjects with offenses that occurred between one and 10 years before completion of their security clearance applications. For miscellaneous other nonfelony offenses, subjects are only required to report offenses within the preceding 7 years. As with the "have you ever offenses," self-reporting of offenses less than 1 year old was lowest. The rates of self-reporting of other offenses, even the oldest offenses for this category, i.e., 5 to 7 years, were approximately equal.

Differences in self-reporting by recency and type of offense followed the same pattern for both military and nonmilitary subjects, although rates of reporting by recency of offense were not significant for the nonmilitary subjects for any of the offenses. Separate displays for military and nonmilitary subjects showing self-reporting by type and recency of offense are provided in Appendix D.

Tables 19 and 20 together indicate that youngest and oldest subjects and oldest and most recent offenses are the least likely to be self-reported. Because younger subjects necessarily have a higher proportion of more recent offenses since they have had fewer years to offend than older subjects, we examined the interaction between age at application and recency of offense. Due to the dramatic differences in the ages of the military and nonmilitary populations, we conducted analyses separately for these two groups. The results are provided in Table 21a for military subjects and Table 21b for nonmilitary subjects.

Table 20
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Time Elapsed Since Offense

Type of Offender	*Age at Application*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	91 to 365 days	54.4	90	■■■■■■■■■■■
	1 to 3 years	66.1	310	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 to 5 years	69.6	135	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	5 to 7 years	68.8	64	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	7 to 10 years	72.7	44	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	GT 10 years	55.9	111	■■■■■■■■■■■
DUI**	91 to 365 days	56.2	370	■■■■■■■■■■■
	1 to 3 years	79.0	1,017	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 to 5 years	82.4	720	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	5 to 7 years	86.1	527	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	7 to 10 years	78.2	559	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	GT 10 years	71.7	900	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Felony**	91 to 365 days	40.1	262	■■■■■■■■
	1 to 3 years	57.1	750	□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 to 5 years	58.5	480	■■■■■■■■■■■
	5 to 7 years	61.9	307	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	7 to 10 years	55.2	286	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	GT 10 years	56.8	484	■■■■■■■■■■■
Firearms or Explosives	91 to 365 days	55.6	9	□□□□□□□□□□□
	1 to 3 years	70.4	27	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	3 to 5 years	75.0	20	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	5 to 7 years	76.5	17	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	7 to 10 years	71.4	14	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	GT 10 years	62.5	24	■■■■■■■■■■■■
Misc. Other**	91 to 365 days	43.0	748	■■■■■■■■■
	1 to 3 years	57.4	2,202	□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 to 5 years	58.0	1,253	■■■■■■■■■■■
	5 to 7 years	53.9	777	■■■■■■■■■■
Other Alcohol**	91 to 365 days	63.3	450	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	1 to 3 years	77.5	1,061	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 to 5 years	78.5	502	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	5 to 7 years	73.9	303	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	7 to 10 years	79.4	228	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	GT 10 years	59.9	252	■■■■■■■■■■■■

**p<.01 for differences by time elapsed since offense within the listed category of offense

For military subjects, as shown in Table 21a, significant differences by age at application were found for offenses that were less than 1 year old and for offenses that were between 3 and 7 years old. Within each of these categories of recency of offenses, the youngest subjects tended to report at the lowest rates whereas subjects who were 22 to 26 at time of application self-reported at the highest rates. Military subjects who were 36 years and older also tended to have among the lowest rates of reporting relative to other age groups for offenses that were between 3 and 5 years old. Subjects who were

between 36 and 41 years of age also had among the lowest rates of reporting for offenses that were 5 to 7 years old.

Table 21a
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Age at Application, Controlling for Recency of Offense: Military Subjects

Recency of Offense	*Age at Application*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
91 to 365 days*	LT 18 yrs	42.7	110	■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	51.6	1,181	□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	51.9	210	■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	39.4	94	■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	35.4	65	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	52.3	44	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	50.0	34	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
1 to 3 years	LT 18 yrs	61.7	141	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	63.5	2,871	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	66.8	861	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	63.9	349	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	63.7	226	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	68.5	146	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	65.3	75	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
3.1 to 5 years*	LT 18 yrs	50.0	42	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	62.4	800	□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	67.8	846	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	64.6	350	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	63.6	198	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	55.7	122	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	57.5	73	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
5.1 to 7 years*	LT 18 yrs	50.0	10	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	50.5	111	□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	68.0	515	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	65.6	366	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	56.2	178	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	51.2	127	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	77.8	72	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
7.1 to 10 years	22 up to 26 yrs	79.8	84	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	69.5	311	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	72.7	132	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	69.6	69	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	64.2	53	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
> 10 years	26 up to 31 yrs	63.9	108	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	58.6	237	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	62.0	200	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	59.9	192	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙

*p<.05 for differences by age at application within the listed recency of offense

For nonmilitary subjects shown in Table 21b, self-reporting of offenses did not vary within conditions of offence recency, regardless of the age of the applicant. Data from Tables 21.a and 21.b reinforce the finding that offenses that are less than 1 year old and greater than 10 years old tended to be less likely to be self-reported.

Table 21b
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Age at Application, Controlling for Recency of Offense: Nonmilitary Subjects

Recency of Offense	*Age at Application*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
91 to 365 days	18 up to 22 yrs	70.6	34	
	22 up to 26 yrs	37.0	27	
	26 up to 31 yrs	54.2	24	
	31 up to 36 yrs	47.8	23	
	36 up to 41 yrs	61.1	36	
	41 and up	61.0	77	
1 to 3 years	18 up to 22 yrs	80.0	60	
	22 up to 26 yrs	79.1	129	
	26 up to 31 yrs	85.8	106	
	31 up to 36 yrs	74.1	85	
	36 up to 41 yrs	82.3	130	
	41 and up	75.2	238	
3.1 to 5 years	18 up to 22 yrs	68.2	22	
	22 up to 26 yrs	88.6	114	
	26 up to 31 yrs	78.2	124	
	31 up to 36 yrs	75.8	99	
	36 up to 41 yrs	82.9	140	
	41 and up	79.0	210	
5.1 to 7 years	22 up to 26 yrs	77.3	110	
	26 up to 31 yrs	79.1	129	
	31 up to 36 yrs	75.0	92	
	36 up to 41 yrs	78.3	106	
	41 and up	74.5	184	
7.1 to 10 years	22 up to 26 yrs	80.0	20	
	26 up to 31 yrs	76.9	91	
	31 up to 36 yrs	72.9	85	
	36 up to 41 yrs	75.5	94	
	41 and up	74.8	163	
> 10 years	26 up to 31 yrs	68.1	47	
	31 up to 36 yrs	71.5	151	
	36 up to 41 yrs	70.9	247	
	41 and up	65.3	597	

*p<.05 for differences by age at application within the listed recency of offense

Self-Reporting by Type of Offense and Number of Offenses

As shown in Table 22, self-reporting of at least one offense tended to be higher among subjects who had two or more different types of offenses to report than subjects who had only one type of offense to report. The difference in self-reports by number of offenses to be reported was greatest among subjects for whom at least one offense was classified as a felony or nonfelony miscellaneous other. Among subjects with drug-, alcohol, or firearms/explosives-related offenses to report, the number of offenses was not strongly associated with the rate of self-reporting at least one offense.

Table 22
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Number of Offense Categories per Subject

Type of Offender	*# of Different Types of Offenses*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	One	63.4	543	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	65.5	177	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	70.8	72	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
DUI	One	76.9	3,601	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	76.7	520	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	69.1	136	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Felony**	One	52.4	1,862	■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	63.0	593	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	65.4	233	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Firearms or Explosives	One	64.3	70	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	80.6	36	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	72.7	11	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Misc. Other**	One	50.6	3,975	■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	66.4	974	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	74.1	290	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Other Alcohol	One	73.5	2,211	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	74.3	583	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	76.4	144	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

**p<.01 for differences within the listed category of offense

Results for the military subjects were consistent with data provided in Table 22, so a separate data display is not provided. For the nonmilitary population, however, a significant association between number of different types of offenses and rates of self-reporting was also found among subjects with nonfelony drinking and driving arrests, charges, or convictions. As shown in Table 22.a, the association was opposite of what was found for felony and miscellaneous other offenders. For the nonmilitary group, subjects with three or more different types of offenses where one of these offenses was a drinking and driving offense self-report at least one offense at a lower rate than subjects with one or two different types of offenses.

Table 22.a
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Offender and Number of Different Types of Offense to Be Reported: Nonmilitary

Type of Offender	*# of Different Types of Offenses*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	One	69.2	117	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	79.2	24	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	81.8	22	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
DUI*	One	82.1	1,434	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	86.4	176	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	70.2	57	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Felony*	One	62.4	508	■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	81.3	150	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	77.8	72	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Firearms or Explosives	One	61.9	21	■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	78.6	14	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	100.0	4	n/a
Misc. Other*	One	60.7	636	■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	71.0	169	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	81.0	63	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Other Alcohol	One	71.7	318	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Two	79.8	84	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	3 or More	73.3	30	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

*p<.05 for differences within the listed category of offense

Self-Reporting by Type of Offense and Record Check Strategy

Table 23 indicates that across most of the offense types, subjects self-reported at fairly similar rates regardless of whether their offense information was found through a local agency check or a statewide check strategy. The two exceptions were that other alcohol and firearm/explosive offenders self-reported at higher rates when they are undergoing a statewide check compared to a local agency check. Other alcohol offenders, undergoing statewide checks, self-report 77% (n = 1,788) of the time compared to 69% for subjects undergoing a local agency check strategy without state repository checks. Rates of self-reporting among firearms/explosive offenders were almost 20 percentage points higher when a statewide check was being conducted compared to rates of self-reporting where local agency checks were conducted. Results were not different between military and nonmilitary subjects, so separate displays have not been provided.

Table 23
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Record Check Strategy

Type of Offender	*Record Check Strategy*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	Local agency	65.2	273	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Statewide	64.2	519	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
DUI	Local agency	77.3	1,345	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Statewide	76.3	2,912	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Felony	Local agency	57.4	933	■■■■■■■■■■■
	Statewide	55.2	1,755	□□□□□□□□□□□
Firearms or * Explosives	Local agency	58.1	43	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Statewide	77.0	74	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Misc. Other**	Local agency	50.2	1,807	■■■■■■■■■■
	Statewide	57.3	3,432	□□□□□□□□□□□
Other Alcohol**	Local agency	69.1	1,150	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	Statewide	76.8	1,788	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

*p<.05 for differences between record check strategy within the listed category of offense
**p<.01 for differences between record check strategy within the listed category of offense

Self-Reporting by Type of Offense and Open Record State Status

Table 24 compares rates of self-reporting between subjects with records in states with open record policies and subjects with records in states that restrict access. Felony offenders from open record states self-reported more often compared to the same type of offenders in closed record states. Miscellaneous other offenders with records in closed record states self-reported at a rate of 56% compared to 52% open record states. Results for both military and nonmilitary subjects were consistent with this finding, so separate displays have not been provided.

Table 24
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Open Record State Status

Type of Offender	*Open Record State?*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	Yes	70.0	110	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	No	63.6	682	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
DUI	Yes	78.2	554	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	No	76.4	3,703	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Felony**	Yes	61.5	447	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	No	54.9	2,241	□□□□□□□□□□□
Firearms or Explosives	Yes	85.7	14	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	No	68.0	103	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Misc. Other*	Yes	51.5	860	■■■■■■■■■■
	No	55.5	4,379	□□□□□□□□□□□
Other Alcohol	Yes	71.2	452	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	No	74.3	2,486	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

*p<.05 for differences between record accessibility within the listed category of offense
**p<.01 for differences between record accessibility within the listed category of offense

Discussion

This study started with a population of subjects from CY00 who were known to have offenses required to be reported on the SF86 and examined the extent to which they actually did so. The effects of several subject and offense characteristics on rates and likelihood of self-reporting were explored, including type and recency of offense to be reported, accessibility of offense information, and subjects' military status, gender, age at time of self-report, level of investigation, and number of different types of offense to be reported. This section reviews key findings from these analyses, followed by a description of the next steps in our research process to identify causes of underreporting and methods by which accuracy and completeness of self-reporting can be improved.

Overview of Findings

Overall, 38% of subjects with apparently reportable offenses did not indicate any criminal arrests, charges, or convictions on the SF86.

Rates of self-reporting varied significantly based on the type of offense to be reported. Alcohol-related offenses were among the most likely to be self-reported, and drinking and driving offenses were more likely to be reported than other alcohol-related offenses. Felony offenses and nonfelony offenses unrelated to alcohol, drugs, firearms, or explosives were among the least likely to be reported.

Self-reporting tended to be lower among military subjects compared with nonmilitary subjects for those undergoing NACLC investigations. Among SSBIs, military subjects had slightly lower rates than nonmilitary subjects in self-reporting only for drinking and driving offenses. The difference between military NACLC and SSBI subjects was significant for all offense categories except firearms and explosives, whereas the difference between NACLC and SSBI nonmilitary subjects was significant only for drinking and driving offenses.

Males tended to self-report at higher rates than females, although overall, differences were significant only for nonfelony drug and miscellaneous other offenses. One exception was that nonmilitary females with nonfelony, nondriving-related alcohol offenses were significantly more likely than males to self-report offense information.

Overall, rates of self-reporting were not significantly different between subjects undergoing initial investigations and periodic reinvestigations, except that PR subjects with nonfelony drinking and driving offenses or felony offenses that were 1 to 3 years old were more likely than initial investigation subjects to self-report at least one offense. For subjects with these same types of offenses that were more than 10 years old, at least one offense was more likely to be reported in initial investigations than in periodic reinvestigations. In all other cases, subjects in initial investigations did not differ significantly from subjects undergoing periodic reinvestigations.

Offenses less than 1 year old and offenses more than 10 years old were least likely to be reported. Offenses less than 1 year old could have occurred, however, after subjects completed their personnel security questionnaires. Otherwise, self-reporting rates did not vary according to the recency of the offense.

There were not consistent differences by age group in self-reporting, controlling for recency and type of offense to be reported. Military subjects were less likely to report juvenile offenses than nonmilitary subjects.

Subjects with multiple types of reportable offenses were not less likely to self-report at least one offense.

In states where investigators relied on state repository checks, subjects with nonfelony alcohol and miscellaneous other types of offenses were more likely to report at least one offense than were subjects with similar types of offense records in states where investigators did not rely on state repository checks. Record check strategy was unrelated to self-reporting of felonies and of nonfelony drug, drinking and driving, and firearms and explosives-related offenses.

Next Steps

Specific recommendations for mitigating underreporting will be offered in a Phase II study to follow up this one. We will describe possible causes for underreporting based on our reviews of relevant literatures, briefings with relevant personnel in the field, and evidence from Defense Office of Hearing and Appeals decisions. The second phase of research draws on real-world perspectives from expert personnel along with social psychological perspectives on deterrence, accounts, impression management, personnel integrity, response bias, and detection of deception in understanding and mitigating underreporting of derogatory information in personnel security investigations. Based on findings from each of these sources, our Phase II report will offer recommendations for improving the rate of admission of reportable offenses on national security clearance questionnaires.

After reviewing our preliminary findings, the Directorate for Accession Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, has recommended that we obtain additional background characteristics of our military population to further explore factors associated with their higher rate of underreporting. For example, military personnel were particularly interested in associations between underreporting and service branch, rank, aptitude, and education.

Finally, depending on the interest of policymakers, there may be value in adding additional years and/or sources of data to supplement those portions of our sample that were still too small, even with one full year of data, to enable drawing reliable conclusions about relationships between self-reporting and some offense and subject characteristics. For example, the number of subjects with firearms and explosives-related offenses were still so few that analyses of self-reporting of these offenses could not be

conducted beyond evaluating overall rates, regardless of subject characteristics and other characteristics of the offense.

It may also be that this and other studies have sufficiently established that underreporting of criminal offense information is a problem, regardless of subject and offense characteristics. Since decision options for mitigating the problem are not likely to be exercised separately for each of the different types of offenses or based on whether subjects are old or young, male or female, the value of further analysis of differences by subject and offense characteristics may not warrant the expenditure of resources required to carry it out. Resources may be better spent on identifying causes and solutions, the purpose of Phase II.

References

Buck, K.R., & Reed, F.M. (2002). *Reliability of centralized criminal record repository checks in local criminal justice agency checks in four U.S. states: California, Florida, Pennsylvania, and Indiana* (Tech. Report-03-1). Monterey, CA: Defense Personnel Security Research Center.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2003). *Improving criminal history records for background checks*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2003). *Survey of state criminal history information systems, 2001*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Connor, J. W. (1997). *The effects of pre-service criminal history on recruit performance in the U.S. Navy*. Unpublished. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.

Flyer, E. S. (1995). *Recruits with a preservice arrest history: Identification, characteristics and behavior on duty*. (Contract DAAL03-91-C-0034). Washington, DC: Directorate for Accession Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Norušis, M. (1999). *SPSS Regression Models 10.0.* Chicago, IL: SPSS.

Security Clearance Information Act of 1985, 5 U.S.C. 9101 (1985).

Trent, T.T. (1998) *Criminal background screening of Navy recruits (AB-34C)*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the International Military Testing Association, Pensacola, FL.

Appendix A

Population Characteristics

Table A-1
States Where Offense Arrest, Charge or Conviction Occurred for the 16,575 Offenses in the Sample

State	*%*	*n*	*State*	*%*	*n*
Alaska	.7	115	North Carolina	.8	126
Alabama	3.4	564	North Dakota	.3	49
Arkansas	1.3	221	Nebraska	1.2	192
Arizona	2.6	435	New Hampshire	.4	67
California	5.2	870	New Mexico	.9	154
Colorado	3.9	644	Nevada	.5	84
Connecticut	.6	103	New York	2.5	476
Washington DC	.7	123	Ohio	3.3	543
Delaware	.6	96	Oklahoma	1.5	243
Florida	6.9	1,145	Oregon	1.5	254
Georgia	6.2	1,026	Pennsylvania	5.0	821
Hawaii	1.2	197	Rhode Island	.1	22
Iowa	1.0	172	South Carolina	.1	12
Idaho	.7	111	South Dakota	.9	152
Illinois	2.1	343	Tennessee	1.6	257
Indiana	1.7	283	Texas	9.6	1,588
Kansas	1.0	158	Utah	.0	167
Kentucky	1.4	231	Virginia	1.0	1,265
Louisiana	1.4	238	Virgin Islands	7.6	3
Massachusetts	2.6	431	Vermont	.0	30
Maryland	2.8	462	Washington	.2	313
Maine	.6	101	Wisconsin	1.9	177
Michigan	1.9	315	West Virginia	1.1	100
Minnesota	1.1	185	Wyoming	.6	53
Missouri	3.7	614	Missing Data	.3	4
Mississippi	.9	143	Total	100.0	16,575
Montana	.6	95			

Appendix B

Overview of Effects on Self-Reporting

Overview of Influences on Self-Reporting

We used multinomial logistic regression, i.e., nominal regression, (Norušis, 1999) to identify significant effects of each different subject and offense characteristic, holding all other characteristics constant. Table 12 shows the likelihood ratio tests with odds of self-reporting any offense regressed on all of the independent variables in our study. The chi-square values show the impact of removing the listed independent variable on the model that has all effects included.

FN: Likelihood ratio tests from nominal regression modeling tools were used to identify which characteristics of offenses and offenders were associated with the likelihood of subjects reporting offense information on their SF86. While MLR is generally understood as the appropriate tool rather than logistic regression to determine associations with nominal-level dependent variables with more than two categories, it can also be used to regress a binary dependent variable on multiple nominal-level independent variables (Norušis, 1999). It provides a relatively straightforward means to produce easily interpreted output for simultaneously exploring the effects of multiple categorical variables against the log odds of a binary outcome.

If removal of the independent variable has no effect on the likelihood of subjects self-reporting offenses, the chi-square value is close to zero and the significance level is greater than .05. In other words, for independent variables with low chi-square values, knowing how a subject is classified according to the values of the variable provides no information about the likelihood of the subject self-reporting information or withholding information. Such effects are deemed not significant.

Table B-1
Likelihood Ratio Tests Showing Degree of Association of Each Subject and Offense Characteristic with Odds of Self-Reporting at Least One Offense on the SF86

Influences on Self-Reporting	*Chi-Square*	*df*	*Sig.*
Intercept	0.0	0	
Type of Offense	609.7	5	0.000
Military Status	147.8	1	0.000
Gender	26.9	1	0.000
Level of investigation	160.9	3	0.000
Initial Investigation or Periodic Reinvestigation	1.2	1	0.264
Age of Subject at Time of Application	17.7	4	0.007
Recency of Offense	193.9	5	0.000
Whether record stored in an open record state	0.6	1	0.429
Number of different types of offenses associated with subject	70.6	2	0.000
Reecord check strategy in state where record stored	5.6	1	0.018

As shown in Table B-1, holding all other values constant, significant independent effects on self-reporting of at least one offense on the SF86 were found for type of offense to be reported, subjects' military status, subjects' gender, level of investigation, age of subject at time of application, recency of offense, number of offenses associated with subjects, and record check strategy. Whether subjects were undergoing initial investigations or periodic reinvestigations, and whether offenses were recorded in open record states did not have independent effects on subjects' likelihood of self-reporting at least one offense on their SF86.

Tables 11 and B12 together show that one of the strongest predictors of self-reporting by subjects is the type of offense information found.[5] Based on this finding and to simplify recognition and interpretation of the nature of the other independent effects on probability of self-reporting, we reran the multinomial regression analyses separately on different groups of subjects classified according to the types of offenses that were found for them through criminal record checks. These analyses confirmed the main effects shown in Table 12, and also surfaced other effects that were only present for a subset of the offenders based on the types of offenses to be reported.

Table B-2 provides a graphical overview of the significant factors that contributed to self-reporting of specific offenses and self-reporting of at least one offense, broken out by characteristics of subjects and by type of offense to be reported. The nature of differences in rates of self-reporting of different types of offenses according to subject and offense characteristics listed in Table B-2 will be elaborated in subsequent sections of the report.

The left side of the table lists the factors that may influence self-reporting, while the columns to the right indicate the types of offenses to be reported. A solid black circle (●) indicates statistically significant differences in rates of self-reporting at least one offense by subjects who differed according to the subject or offense characteristics listed on the left side of the table.

[5] Additionally, we ran multinomial regression analyses to explore interaction effects for each of the main effects with type of offense. Significant interactions with type of offense were found for each independent effect listed in Table 12 except for gender, subjects' age at application, and type of investigation (i.e., whether subjects' were undergoing initial investigations or periodic reinvestigations). With these significant interaction effects included in the analysis, main effects were found for gender and age at application but not for type of investigation.

Table B-2
Significant Influences on Self-Reporting of Specific Types of Offenses or of Any Type of Offense on the SF86, Holding All Other Influences Constant

Influences on Self-Reporting		*Type of Offender*					
		Felony	***DUI***	***Other Alcohol***	***Drug***	***Firearm Explosive***	***Misc. Other***
Subject Characteristics	Military status	●	●	●	●		●
	Level of investigation	●	●	●		●	●
	Gender						●
	Initial or periodic reinvestigation			(●)*			
	Age at time of application	●	●	●			●
Offense Characteristics	Time elapsed since offense	●	●	●			●
	Number of different types of offenses	●					●
	Age at time of offense			●			
	Record check strategy			●			
	Open records State	●					

● = significant for reports of at least one offense, regardless of type of offense

* = asterisked symbols indicate p values of between .05 and .07, suggesting a trend towards an effect, even though the threshold for statistical significance has not been met.

Appendix C

Analysis of Self-Reporting by Military by Age

Table C-1
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Age at Application: Military

Type of Offese	*Age at Application*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug*	Less than 18 yrs	64.7	17	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	62.3	374	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	69.7	119	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	58.3	48	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	73.9	23	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	38.5	13	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	18.8	16	◙◙◙◙
DUI*	Less than 18 yrs	47.4	19	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	64.6	520	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	77.2	474	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	78.1	494	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	73.3	438	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	72.5	353	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	77.1	258	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
Felony	Less than 18 yrs	45.5	44	■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	50.8	783	□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	57.5	426	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	50.9	281	■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	48.8	170	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	51.0	98	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	47.1	85	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
Firearms or	18 up to 22 yrs	63.6	22	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
Explosives	22 up to 26 yrs	81.0	21	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	61.5	13	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	62.5	8	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	100.0	2	n/a
	41 and up	62.5	8	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
Misc. Other*	Less than 18 yrs	50.6	156	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	52.9	2,013	□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	58.2	943	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	52.0	502	■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	51.0	310	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	46.4	194	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	57.8	102	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
Other Alcohol*	Less than 18 yrs	66.2	68	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	74.6	1,337	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	79.8	563	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	73.4	293	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	62.2	111	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	69.8	53	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	36.1	36	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙

*p<.05 for differences by age at application within the listed category of offense

Table C-2
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Type of Offense and Age at Application: Nonmilitary

Type of Offense	*Age at Application*	*Self-Report Any Offense %*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
Drug	Less than 18 yrs	0.0	1	n/a
	18 up to 22 yrs	100.0	8	n/a
	22 up to 26 yrs	71.4	21	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	76.5	17	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	66.7	21	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	36 up to 41 yrs	77.1	35	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	41 and up	69.5	59	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
DUI*	Less than 18 yrs	100.0	2	n/a
	18 up to 22 yrs	75.0	20	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	89.5	86	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	88.2	187	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	84.3	249	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	36 up to 41 yrs	81.5	378	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	41 and up	79.4	722	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Felony*	Less than 18 yrs	100.0	2	n/a
	18 up to 22 yrs	71.4	21	□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	84.6	52	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	68.4	98	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	61.1	90	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	36 up to 41 yrs	72.7	139	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	41 and up	64.6	316	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
Firearms or	18 up to 22 yrs	100.0	1	n/a
Explosives	22 up to 26 yrs	66.7	3	n/a
	26 up to 31 yrs	75.0	4	n/a
	31 up to 36 yrs	85.7	7	n/a
	36 up to 41 yrs	50.0	8	n/a
	41 and up	71.4	14	n/a
Misc. Other	Less than 18 yrs	66.7	3	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	64.1	39	□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	69.8	129	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	69.1	149	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	57.3	124	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	36 up to 41 yrs	69.2	143	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	41 and up	59.3	268	■■■■■■■■■■■■
Other Alcohol*	18 up to 22 yrs	77.5	40	□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	82.5	120	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	81.4	70	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	63.5	52	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	36 up to 41 yrs	66.7	57	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	41 and up	63.2	87	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

*p<.05 for differences by age at application within the listed category of offense

Appendix D

Self-Reporting by Recency of Offense and Age at Application, by Military Status

Table D-1
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Age at Application, Controlling for Recency of Offense: Military Subjects

Recency of Offense	*Age at Application*	*Self-Report Any Offense*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
91 to 365 days*	LT 18 yrs	42.7%	110	■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	51.6%	1,181	□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	51.9%	210	■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	39.4%	94	■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	35.4%	65	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	52.3%	44	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	50.0%	34	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
1 to 3 years	LT 18 yrs	61.7%	141	■■■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	63.5%	2,871	□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	66.8%	861	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	63.9%	349	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	63.7%	226	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	68.5%	146	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	65.3%	75	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
3.1 to 5 years*	LT 18 yrs	50.0%	42	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	62.4%	800	□□□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	67.8%	846	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	64.6%	350	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	63.6%	198	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	55.7%	122	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	57.5%	73	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
5.1 to 7 years*	LT 18 yrs	50.0%	10	■■■■■■■■■■
	18 up to 22 yrs	50.5%	111	□□□□□□□□□□
	22 up to 26 yrs	68.0%	515	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	65.6%	366	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	56.2%	178	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	51.2%	127	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	77.8%	72	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
7.1 to 10 years	22 up to 26 yrs	79.8%	84	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	26 up to 31 yrs	69.5%	311	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	72.7%	132	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	69.6%	69	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	64.2%	53	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙
> 10 years	26 up to 31 yrs	63.9%	108	■■■■■■■■■■■■■
	31 up to 36 yrs	58.6%	237	▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬
	36 up to 41 yrs	62.0%	200	◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘◘
	41 and up	59.9%	192	◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙◙

*p<.05 for differences by age at application within the listed recency of offense

Table D-2
Self-Reporting of Any Offense by Age at Application, Controlling for Recency of Offense: Nonmilitary Subjects

Recency of Offense	*Age at Application*	*Self-Report Any Offense*	*Total n*	*Graphic Display (One Square = 5%)*
91 to 365 days	18 up to 22 yrs	70.6%	34	
	22 up to 26 yrs	37.0%	27	
	26 up to 31 yrs	54.2%	24	
	31 up to 36 yrs	47.8%	23	
	36 up to 41 yrs	61.1%	36	
	41 and up	61.0%	77	
1 to 3 years	18 up to 22 yrs	80.0%	60	
	22 up to 26 yrs	79.1%	129	
	26 up to 31 yrs	85.8%	106	
	31 up to 36 yrs	74.1%	85	
	36 up to 41 yrs	82.3%	130	
	41 and up	75.2%	238	
3.1 to 5 years	18 up to 22 yrs	68.2%	22	
	22 up to 26 yrs	88.6%	114	
	26 up to 31 yrs	78.2%	124	
	31 up to 36 yrs	75.8%	99	
	36 up to 41 yrs	82.9%	140	
	41 and up	79.0%	210	
5.1 to 7 years	22 up to 26 yrs	77.3%	110	
	26 up to 31 yrs	79.1%	129	
	31 up to 36 yrs	75.0%	92	
	36 up to 41 yrs	78.3%	106	
	41 and up	74.5%	184	
7.1 to 10 years	22 up to 26 yrs	80.0%	20	
	26 up to 31 yrs	76.9%	91	
	31 up to 36 yrs	72.9%	85	
	36 up to 41 yrs	75.5%	94	
	41 and up	74.8%	163	
> 10 years	26 up to 31 yrs	68.1%	47	
	31 up to 36 yrs	71.5%	151	
	36 up to 41 yrs	70.9%	247	
	41 and up	65.3%	597	

*p<.05 for differences by age at application within the listed recency of offense